DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 467 SP 027 851

AUTHOR Labaree, David F.
TITLE Proletarianizing the High School Teacher.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 16 Mar 86
GRANT NIE-9-0173
NOTE 37p.; Revision of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; High Schools; *Professional Autonomy; *Professional Recognition; *Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to explore the process by which the high school teacher lost his position of power and privilege and to consider the implications of this process for a fuller understanding of the history of schooling during the period of decline. This change is analyzed by looking in both the earlier and later periods at three different elements that defined the position of these teachers--the status of high school teachers in relation to the rest of the teaching force, the method used in recruiting these teachers, and the degree of autonomy that they exercised in governing the high school. The discussion is based on a case study of a prominent early high school for boys, the Central High School of Philadelphia (1841-1907), and draws on a variety of archival sources--including faculty meeting minutes, faculty biographies (compiled by an early historian of the school), and annual reports. Several tables and a list of references are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272467

PROLETARIANIZING THE HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER

David F. Labaree

Department of Teacher Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

Revised March 16, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. F. Labaree

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE 027 855

Prepared for presentation at the April 1986 meeting of the American Educational Research Association. The research for this paper was made possible by grant no. 9-0173 from the National Institute of Education (Michael Katz, principal investigator).

Not for reproduction, quotation, or any other use without the permission of the author.

The bureaucratization of public school administration at the turn of the century was associated with a variety of changes that promoted the professionalization of teaching. These changes included increases in the requirements for certification, the average education level of teachers, the number of normal schools, the length of the professional training course, the degree of separation of teaching and politics, and, as Elsbree (1939, p. 434) has calculated, a sizeable increase in teachers' real earnings. In all these ways, public schoolteachers in the early twentieth century were better off than their politically dependent, underqualified, and underpaid nineteenth-century counterparts, whose lowly status has been vividly portrayed by Elsbree (1939), Hostadter (1963), and a number of their own contemporaries.

While this picture fits the changes in the situation of the average teacher at the turn of the century -- who was a young single woman teaching temporarily in an elementary school -- the experience of high school teachers during this period was entirely different. At the same time that their lower school counterparts were registering significant gains, America's older and largely male high school teachers -- who had already established a pattern of independent professionalism -- underwent a dramatic loss of professional autonomy and moved toward proletarianization. The net result of these two divergent trends -- professionalizing elementary teachers and proletarianizing secondary teachers -- was a convergence between the two groups early in the twentieth century as the extraordinary social distance which once separated the two shrank to a more modest proportion.

The aim of this paper is to explore the process by which the high school teacher lost his position of power and privilege and to consider the implications of this process for a fuller understanding of the history of schooling during the period of decline. I analyze this change by taking a look, in both the earlier and later periods, at three different elements that defined the position of these teachers -- the status of high school teachers in relation to the rest of the teaching force, the method used in recruiting these teachers, and the degree of autonomy that they exercised in governing the high school. The discussion is based on a case study of a prominent early high school for boys, the Central High School of Philadelphia (Labaree 1983, especially chapter 2) and draws on a variety of archival sources -- including faculty meeting minutes, faculty biographies (compiled by an early historian of the school), and annual reports.

A POSITION OF PRIVILEGE: 1838-1889

Status: Central High School opened its doors in 1838, and for the next 50 years the faculty occupied a very special position within the city's school system. This unique status reflected an accumulation of special characteristics, the most salient being that Central was the only public high school for boys in the city. (In a sense it was the only true high school for either sex, since Girls High functioned primarily as a normal school.) The uniqueness of the school elevated the Central faculty to a position of public prominence and respect far beyond that of the ordinary teacher, with the result that its members were accorded such honors as being

accorded the title professor and having their names listed among the dignitaries in the back of the city directory. The elite status of these professors was underscored by their relative scarcity and their gender. In 1880 a total of 2,075 teachers worked in the Philadelphia school system, but only 16 of them taught at the high school; and while 96% of the city's teachers were women, Central's faculty was 100% male.

The highly stratified structure of teaching in nineteenth century Philadelphia bears little resemblance to the egalitarian structure identified by modern observers. (Lortie 1975) And the uniquely privileged position of the high school professor within the earlier pattern is most clearly visible through an examination of teacher pay. For Philadelphia teachers as a whole I have data on average pay level, while for the high school there are data on maximum pay level. Comparing the two will tend to exaggerate the high school advantage to some extent, but, since the extended tenure of the high school professors put most of them at the upper pay limit, this exaggeration was by no means great enough to account for the extreme difference revealed by such a comparison.[1] In 1879, the average Philadelphia schoolteacher was paid $486,[2] while the maximum pay for Central professors in the same year was $1925. This means that high school professors were paid as much as four times what elementary school teachers were paid within the same public school system.

Table 1 shows a more detailed comparison over time of the maximum pay levels at Central with those at Girls High and the boys' and girls' grammar schools. Before 1879, when the restructuring of

teacher pay began, the distribution of pay fell into a consistent pattern, revealing the guiding principles behind this pattern. One such principle was **position**. Within the same gender and the same type of school, principals were paid more than teachers. The second principle was **gender**. Female grammar school teachers and principals were paid exactly one-half of what their male counterparts were paid. The third principle for stratifying pay was **status of school**. Thus male grammar school principals were paid only 83% of what a Central professor earned, while female grammar school principals earned more than Girls High School teachers. Note how these three principles were additive -- with Central professors enjoying the benefits of gender and school effects while the central president drew from all three -- but how gender tended to overpower position and how school status dominated both. As an example of the latter, note the relationship between the faculties at Central and Girls: the latter teachers not only experienced the customary 50% discount for being women but an additional loss for being associated with a less prestigious high school -- leaving them at one-third of the Central pay level and only slightly above the elementary school average.

Recruitment: Given the high level of social and economic rewards associated with a teaching position at Central High School, the demand for these positions was strong and hiring policies were correspondingly selective. Fortunately the characteristics of the men who emerged successful in this process are a matter of record, thanks to the efforts of a historian on the faculty who compiled a mini-biography for everyone who taught at the school during the

nineteenth century. (Edmonds 1902, 319-349) These biographies show that within 20 years of the founding of the high school, Central developed a clear pattern of recruitment that it retained until 1890. (See Tables 2 through 5.)[3] The modal Central High School professor during this period was a Central graduate with no further education who had taught grammar school for a dozen or so years and then in his 30s won a position at the high school. Let us look at these characteristics in more detail.

As soon as possible after the opening of the school, Central began hiring its own graduates; no fewer that four members of the first graduating class eventually joined the faculty. From 1860 on, a consistent one-half of the faculty came from this source, while just over a third (with some overlap) had college degrees.[4] The practice of hiring alumni reflects not the nepotism of faculty recruitment but its meritocratic character. In order to graduate from Central High School, a boy had to pass an entrance exam in competition with boys from all over the city and then survive a rigorous academic regime within the school that eliminated three-quarters of those admitted. (Labaree 1986) A Central graduate was thus an academic high-achiever and a proven competitor. The clearest sign of this is that the proportion of alumni among the school's newly hired faculty was highest during those years when a written entrance exam was the sole criterion for employment.

The existence of such a meritocratic route to the Central faculty is confirmed by the career path followed by these men on their way to the top spot. After graduation, the typical future professor began teaching as an assistant in one of the city's male

grammar schools, rising eventually to the rank of principal. The most successful of these then moved on to the high school, with success measured in terms of who was able to qualify the most students for admission into the high school. This competition for a position on the high school faculty was intense, spurred on by published comparisons of each grammar school's performance on the high school entrance exam. The men who reached the high school faculty in this period, therefore, were experienced teachers who had proven both their own academic skills and their ability to train others in the same skills.

Autonomy: Hired on the basis of academic performance, as demonstrated through an extensive process of open competition, Central professors were a naturally independent group with little taste for taking orders. In the absence of bureaucratic interference during the school's first 50 years, the professors were in fact allowed to govern the school very much on their own. The faculty met every week as a parliamentary body to set policy and decide matters, large and small, relating to the governance of the school. Faculty meeting minutes show that everything from establishing a new curriculum to imposing demerits on a recalcitrant student required action by the faculty as a whole, employing the full array of parliamentary procedure.[5] Note that the degree of autonomy enjoyed by Central's faculty went well beyond the pallid and largely negative form of autonomy attributed to contemporary teachers by the theory of loose-coupling. (Lortie 1975, Bidwell 1965, Weick 1976) These professors had more than just the freedom from administrative control that derived from the self-contained

classroom; they had the ability to establish their own collegial system of control. This was not the autonomy of isolation but the autonomy of self governance.

THE SLIDE INTO SUBORDINATION: 1889-1915

The 1880s were years of transition for Central High School and for its faculty. This decade marked a surge in bureaucratic development within the school system, a decline in the position of the high school, and a sharp rise in the size of high school enrollments. The critical year was 1889, when the high school committee of the school board appointed an outside president for the school and gave him a clear mandate for radical change. The third section of this paper explores the reasons for this series of changes, but at this point I want to discuss the form taken by these changes and their impact on the position of the high school professor. As before, I will look at the situation of the professor during this period from the perspective of his status, recruitment, and autonomy.

Status: The special character of the high school and the elevated status of its faculty shifted into a state of decline during the 1880s. The board opened a new high school for boys in 1883, giving Central its first taste of competition, and it opened a second in 1890. Not only was Central's uniqueness brought to an end, but the school was soon to suffer the indignity of being swamped by a flood of new secondary schools: by 1915 the city had no fewer than 15 high schools. Under such circumstances, being a high school professor was no longer such a rare honor. Even within

Central itself the meaning of a faculty position was watered down by a massive increase in the size of the school. (See Table 6.) After remaining at a level of 500 to 600 students for 20 years, the school began to grow rapidly in 1892, doubling in size by 1900 and doubling again by 1910. Meanwhile the number of faculty members grew from the longstanding figure of 16 to 22 in 1892, 54 in 1900, and 84 in 1910.

Mirroring this loss of status was the decline and eventual loss of the sizeable pay advantage enjoyed by Central professor in the earlier period. As Table 1 shows, the school board in 1879 began a longterm process of equalizing teacher pay. The gender gap began to close immediately, as the pay of Girls High School teachers rose in 1879 from 34% to 42% of the pay of Central professors -- growing to 50% in 1895, 66% in 1908 and achieving full equality in 1920. At the same time the status gap between Central and other schools also began to close. For about ten years the pay of teachers at the new manual training high schools hovered around 80% of the level paid Central professors until attaining parity in 1901. The emergent principle that governed the new distribution of teacher pay in the Philadelphia schools was the weakest component of the earlier pay pattern, **position**. After 70 years of receiving a fraction (usually about 80%) of the amount paid to Central professors, the principals of the male grammar schools finally edged past the professors on the pay scale in 1913. In sum, the Central faculty's old sources of advantage, gender and school status, simply evaporated during these years; and in the eyes of the new pay standard, position, they were merely the occupants of a generic subordinate status, teacher.

Making the point clearly, the superintendent in 1915 abolished the title professor.

Recruitment: The method of recruiting Central professors changed dramatically late in the 1880s. At about the same time that the school shifted from a practical-terminal curriculum to an academic curriculum aimed at preparation for college, the school board ordered that the school hire only college men for its faculty. Central continued to hire a high proportion of its faculty from its own alumni, but otherwise the profile of the men acquired through the mass hirings of the 1890s was strikingly different from the faculty profile in the earlier era. Unlike his predecessor, the modal professor in this cohort was a young recent college graduate with a degree in arts and sciences and without any teaching experience. This meant that the old performance standard for attaining a position at the high school was abandoned in favor of a new credential standard.

The early candidate had to prove himself worthy to teach at Central by demonstrating his skill as a teacher in the lower schools for a number of years and only then seeking to move up within the school system. Central stood at the top of a career ladder for male public school teachers, and to move from one rung to another required the candidate to emerge successfully from a vigorous meritocratic competition. Under the new system, mere possession of a college degree was sufficient qualification. Note that for the female elementary school teacher, an increase in the educational credentials necessary to enter teaching represented a move in the direction of professionalism and thus provided a status boost.

However for the male high school teacher, the imposition of a credential standard had a negative effect on status. The reason is that the old performance standard was designed to select men from a surfeit of candidates to fill a tiny number of positions. It thinned out the crowd in a meritocratically acceptable way, highlighting the scarcity of professorships and thereby heightening their value to the incumbents. By contrast, the new credential standard was designed to make it possible to find candidates to fill a large and growing number of vacancies. It served to reduce scarcity, increase the accessibility of high school teaching, and thus undercut the status of this occupation.

Autonomy: As the Central professor turned into an ordinary teacher and the competition for positions yielded to the bloodless pursuit of a college degree, autonomy skidded toward subordination. With the passing of Central High School's special position within the school system, the maintenance of faculty autonomy was hard to defend. And with the replacement of the school's independent, experienced, and competitive group of ex-principals by a collection of untested and inexperienced college boys, the faculty no longer had the stature or the will to practice self governance. After heading their own schools, the earlier professors were both capable of running Central and willing to accept nothing less. But the new teachers at the turn of the century were entering as raw novices in a clearly subordinate post (with the title of instructor) and were thus in no position to lay claim to the leadership of the school.

The result was a rapid shift toward proletarianization. At the instigation of the school board, the new president in 1889 ended the weekly faculty meeting. Thereafter, the faculty as a whole met infrequently at the pleasure of the president, and it dealt with a sharply declining share of the issues involved in school governance. The responsibility for governance moved into other hands. The superintendent acquired some of the powers that once rested with the faculty -- including control over admissions procedure, curriculum, and faculty hiring. By default, Central's president picked up responsibility for many of the the day-to-day administrative decisions. In addition, in the 1890s the president established a structure of academic departments within the school, and these units became important loci for dealing with discipline-based issues. Finally, an elaborate system of faculty committees quickly evolved for dealing with a wide variety of school-wide administrative concerns within functionally specific boundaries (identified by such titles as "roster," "lateness," "hygiene," and "recess").

This change in governance involved two related transfers of power. One was a vertical transfer to the superintendent and the president of powers that once resided with the faculty. Another was the horizontal dispersion into a number of academically and functionally specialized faculty units (departments and committees) of powers that had once been exercised by the faculty as a whole. In the process the faculty's collective responsibility for the governance of the school disappeared. Under the new regime, the faculty members retained a role carrying out narrowly defined administrative assignments, but they no longer had the means to

develop an overview of the school's policies and operations. Only the president had such a perspective. Collective responsibility for the school fractured into individual duty assignments. A political structure, collegial governance, was transformed into a technical structure, administration, and the teachers became its functionaries.

The minutes of the faculty meeting capture the changing condition of the high school professor during this period. The pre-1889 meetings provide a straightforward record of parliamentary proceedings, complete with moves and seconds, amendments, points of order, and roll-call votes. The record shows a faculty which is politically contentious and deeply involved in all aspects of school governance. But as the frequency of faculty meetings declined and the dispersion of faculty powers advanced, the character of the meetings changed as well. Parliamentary forms began to disappear, and the old decision-making body increasingly became a place for administrative announcements. It is significant that the period of sharpest status loss for the Central faculty (1913-1915, when the most radical changes in relative pay took place) was the point when these men began to focus their discussion on status concerns. From this point on, two of the topics most frequently talked about in Central's faculty meetings were the prospects and mechanisms for raising teacher salaries and the activities of a variety of professional teacher organizations. These discussions dealt with political and organizational tactics, the importance of membership in various lobbying groups, and the assessment of dues. During the next two decades the minutes show that Central's faculty as a whole

joined and elected representatives to four different teacher organizations.

These organizations represented the new collegiality of the Central faculty. Unlike the old collegiality, whose focus on governance reflected the dominant position of the earlier professors, the new form aimed at the issues of security and salary, reflecting the subordinated status of the professors in later years. Once a political body, the faculty had become more like a group of employees seeking seeking union representation.

FROM PROFESSIONAL TO PROLETARIAN: UNDERSTANDING THE DECLINE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PROFESSOR

The Early Market Structure of Schooling: The best way to understand the decline of the Central High School professor is by looking at the rise of bureaucratic organization in the Philadelphia school system. During the early period, the city's schools functioned outside of bureaucratic control. An elected board within each ward governed the operation of the schools within that ward, while a city-wide board of school controllers (elected by the ward boards) had little legal authority or political independence. Given such comprehensive decentralization and lacking the leadership of a superintendent (the first was not hired until 1882), the structure of the city's schools constituted an extreme version of the organizational type Katz (1975) calls democratic localism.

However, within this decentralized structure a system of centralized control developed with Central High School in the command position. The only school of its kind in the second largest

city in the county, Central offered a scarce and valuable cultural commodity, a high school diploma, and families pressed their sons to compete vigorously for the chance of acquiring this prize. At the same time grammar school teachers were competing to admit large numbers of their students in order to qualify for their own prize, a seat on the high school faculty. Between parental pressures and teacher ambition, lower school curricula were reshaped to prepare students for the high school entrance exam. The result was that, in effect, Central wrote the curriculum for the school system -- not through bureaucratic control but through market power.[4]

This market structure of schooling in Philadelphia persisted for most of Central's first 50 years, and its benefits for the high school faculty during this period are readily apparent. In the absence of a bureaucratically empowered superintendent or school board, the professors were the highest ranking and most influential educators in the city. They had competed for and won a position at the apex of the educational pyramid and now had the power to determine how the high school's favors should be distributed. And this power carried considerable legitimacy since they had proven themselves within the market stucture of schooling, both as students and teachers, under the meritocratic standard that provided the explicit rationale for this structure. Given all this, it is understandable why these men were given so much prestige, pay, and autonomy. They were truly a breed apart, and their rewards could hardly be the same as ordinary teachers. Besides, who was in a position to contain them?

The Rise of Bureaucracy, Enrollments, and Credentials: The elevated position of the high school professor began to collapse in the 1880s in response to two forms of change -- one in the organization of the school system and the other in the market for high school credentials. The early high-school-dominated structure of schooling started to experience erosion in the 1870s when an incipiently bureaucratic school board imposed a quota system on the high school entrance exam, a move that interfered with the formerly unregulated workings of the market and undercut Central's power. The newly arrived superintendent took over the design and administration of the exam in 1885, and in 1900 the exam was finally abandoned in favor of admission by grammar school certificate.

At the same time that the administration was hacking away at the meritocratic roots of the high school's power, the supply side of the high school market exploded. First one competitor appeared, then another, then a series of others -- coinciding with a dramatic increase in Central's own enrollment. The result was that within less than a decade, the high school and its faculty had lost their singularity. Thus by the 1890s, both of the elements that formed the basis for Central's dominant position -- scarce supply and meritocratic selection -- were in full retreat, leaving the faculty at the turn of the century in markedly reduced circumstances.

The authority to establish full-fledged bureaucratic control over the school system and the high school arrived in the form of two state laws, in 1905 and 1911, which removed power from the ward boards and lodged it in a powerful central school board and superintendent. Acting quickly, the board reorganized the city's

high schools in 1912, making them all into comprehensive regional high schools, including Central. These changes served to formalize and accelerate the process of decline that had been affecting the Central faculty for the previous 30 years. One need only recall that, within a year or two of this action, high school salaries dipped below the level of lower school principals, the title of professor disappeared, and the Central faculty began talking more like disgruntled employees than self-governing professionals.

Closely related to bureaucratic growth is another issue that resonates throughout this case study of dominance and decline in high school teaching: the growing significance of educational credentials.[7] I argued that a rise in credential requirements near the turn of the century simultaneously helped to elevate the status of the female elementary teacher and depress the status of the male high school teacher. The reason is this is embedded in the nature of these requirements. Credentials are a crude measure of academic merit, a certification of competence by an educational organization on behalf of a former student who hopes to use this certificate as a qualification for work or further schooling. By taking the word of the credential-granting school, the next school or employer can save itself the trouble of establishing candidate competence through direct performance measures.

The average nineteenth-century teacher needed to have her competence certified by agencies outside the school system in order to develop more credibility and personal independence within the schools -- to establish herself as more than a mere employee. But the high school teacher already had everything that the other

teachers could hope for -- power, money, prestige -- and his claim to competence was supported not by a diploma (whose meaning was open to question) but by means of a highly visible test of on-the-job performance. The shift from a performance standard to a credential standard for high school teachers, therefore, meant trading a hard measure for a soft measure, experience for prospects. As a result of this change, high school teaching could and did become a mass occupation and the status of this occupation drifted steadily downward, finally converging with a longstanding mass occupation, elementary teachers.

The growth of credentialism in high school teaching was spurred by the expansion of educational bureaucracy. This bureaucratic expansion transformed the structure of pay distribution for the system's teachers by suppressing gender and school prestige as criteria for establishing pay level and by elevating position in their place. Such a change follows naturally from the essential character of a bureaucracy, which is a formal structure of offices rather than officeholders. In this form of organization, position is primary and personnel are allocated to these positions on the basis of their presumed qualifications to fill them. Educational credentials, then, become a necessary part of this process because they provide a bureaucracy with a standardized method for defining the appropriate competences required by a given position and for certifying whether a particular person is qualified for that position.

In the days when Philadelphia's schools were structured by the market rather than bureaucratic directive, positions on the high school faculty were so loosely defined that incumbents were left with considerable autonomy in carrying out their duties, and men were recruited for these positions based on their entrepreneurial behavior rather than their writs of competence. But as bureaucratic organization took over the school system, a position on a high school faculty acquired clear and narrow limits, recruitment for this position moved toward formal certification, and the early high school teacher's assertive autonomy was forced to hide behind the classroom door.

TABLE 1

SALARIES OF CENTRAL PROFESSORS COMPARED WITH OTHER PHILADELPHIA EDUCATORS(a)

(% of Central professors' salary for each year)

Year	Central prof	High president		Girls' High principal		High teacher		Male gram schl prin		Fem gram schl prin	
	$	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
1841		2000									
1842	1350	1600	119					900	67	450	33
1843	"	"	"					"	"	"	"
1844	"	"	"					"	"	"	"
1845	"	"	"					"	"	"	"
1846	"	"	"					1000	74	500	37
1847	"	"	"	1000	74	250	19	"	"	"	"
1848	"	"	"	"	"	300	22	"	"	"	"
1849	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1850	1500	2000	133	1200	80	"	20	"	67	"	33
1851	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1852	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1853	1650	2200	133	1350	82	380	23	1200	73	600	36
1854	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1855	"	"	"	1650	100	500	30	"	"	"	"
1856	1500	2000	133	1500	100	"	33	"	80	"	40
1857	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1858	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1859	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1860	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1861	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1862	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"

Year	Central High prof $	Central High president $	Central High president %	Girls' High principal $	Girls' High principal %	Girls' High teacher $	Girls' High teacher %	Male gram schl $	Male gram prin %	Fem gram schl $	Fem gram prin %	Manual training principal $	Manual training principal %	Manual training teacher $	Manual training teacher %
1863	1800	2250	125	1800	100	600	33	1500	83	750	42				
1864	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1865	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1866	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1867	1980	2475	125	1980	100	660	33	1650	83	825	42				
1868	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1869	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1870	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1871	2178	2722	125	2178	100	735	34	1815	83	907.50	42				
1872	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1873	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1874	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1875	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1876	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1877	2069	2586	125	2069	100	698	34	1724	83	862	42				
1878	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1879	1925	2400	125	2200	114	825(b)	43	1595	83	1000	52				
1880	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1881	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1882	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1883	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	" (c)	"	" (c)	"				
1884	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1885	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"				
1886	1975	2450	124	2450	124	875	44	1645	83	1050	53	2450	124	1975	100
1887	2178	2715	125	2450	112	"	40	1815	83	"	48	"	112	"	91
1888	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1889	"	4000	184	2700	124	1025	47	"	"	1200	55	2580	118	2067	95
1890	"	"	"	3000	138	1100	51	"	"	"	"	2700	124	2178	100
1891	2500	"	160	"	120	"	44	"	73	"	48	"	108	"	87
1892	"	"	"	3050	122	1150	46	1865	75	1250	50	3000	120	2000	80

Year	Central High prof $	Central High president $	Central High president %	Girls' High(d) principal $	Girls' High(d) principal %	Girls' High(d) teacher $	Girls' High(d) teacher %	Male gram schl prin $	Male gram schl prin %	Fem gram schl prin $	Fem gram schl prin %	Manual training principal $	Manual training principal %	Manual training teacher $	Manual training teacher %
1893	2500	4000	160	4000	160	1150	46	1865	75	1250	50	3000	120	2000	80
1894	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1895	"	"	"	"	"	1250	50	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1896	" (e)	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1897	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1898	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1899	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1900	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1901	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3500	140	2500	100
1902	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1903	"	"	"	"	"	1350	54	2015	81	1400	56	"	"	"	"
1904	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1905	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1906	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1907	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"

Year	Male high sch teachers $	High sch principals $	High sch principals %	Female high sch teachers $	Female high sch teachers %	Male gram sch principals $	Male gram sch principals %	Female gram sch principals $	Female gram sch principals %	Male gram sch teachers $	Male gram sch teachers %	Female gram sch teachers
1908	2500	4500	180	1650	66	2115	85	1400	56			
1909	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"			
1910	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"			
1911	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"			
1912	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"			

Year	Male high sch teachers	High sch principals		Female high sch teachers		Male(f) gram sch principals		Female(f) gram sch principals		Male gram sch teachers		Female gram sch teachers	
	$	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
1913	2500	4500	180	1650	66	2500	100	2500	100	1300	52	1000	40
1914	2700	"	167	1750	65	3100	115	3100	115	1400	52	1100	41
1915	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1916	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1917	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1918	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1919	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"

Year	High school teachers	High school principals		Grammar sch supervising principals		Grammar school teachers	
	$	$	%	$	%	$	%
1920	2632	5060	192	3700	141	1800	68
1921	3200	5500	172	4000	125	2000	63
1922	3600	"	153	"	111	"	56
1923	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1924	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1925	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1926	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1927	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1928	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1929	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1930	"	"	"	"	"	2400	67
1931	"	"	"	4500	125	"	"
1932	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1933	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1934	"	"	"	"	"	"	"

Source: Philadelphia Board of Public Education, Annual Reports, 1838 to 1940.

(a) Included under the heading of Central professors are all those who taught at the school, whether or not they had that title. Pay levels shown are all maximums -- the top pay permitted for each category of educator. See text for discussion of the relative merits of maximum vs. average pay measures.

(b) Starting this year there were several men teaching at Girls' High at more advanced pay levels than the women. The figures in this column are the maximum pay levels for female teachers only.

(c) In this year the board began a policy of paying a $200 bonus to supervising principals above the regular principal rate shown here.

(d) The figures for prior years are for Girls' High and Normal School. But the two segments separated this year and the figures given here are for Girls' High School alone.

(e) Beginning in 1896 Central had a multi-level pay scale. The new maximum rates were: department head, $3,000; professor, $2,500; assistant, $1,800; and instructor, $1,250. In order to be consistent and because they were the largest group numerically, I have shown only the pay for professors.

(f) Starting in 1913 the principal rates on the table are for supervising principals only, for that is the year that the board made them the normative case.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE AGE AND TENURE OF CENTRAL PROFESSORS

	1840	1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	Average/ faculty
Age in sample year	42.9	37.8	40.2	38.9	47.0	41.6	35.9	40.6
Age at start	41.6	31.1	30.2	30.8	36.9	29.8	28.3	32.7
Years at Central (total)	10.4	19.2	19.9	25.0	30.3	28.2	24.0	23.0
Age at leaving	52.0	50.3	50.1	55.8	67.2	58.0	52.3	55.1
Years at Central (as of sample yr)	1.3	6.7	8.0	8.1	10.1	11.8	7.6	7.7
Total professors	8	10	15	16	16	20	55	

Source: Franklin S. Edmonds, History of the Central High School of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1902), pp. 319-349. See text for discussion of sampling method.

TABLE 3

EDUCATION LEVEL OF CENTRAL PROFESSORS

(% of total professors for each year)

	1840		1850		1860		1870		1880		1890		1900		Ave/ fac
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	%
Attended Central(a)	0	0	2	20	7	47	8	50	7	44	11	55	25	45	44
Attended college(a)	3	38	4	40	6	40	8	50	9	56	12	60	46	84	53
Non-college professional training	3	38	1	10	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total professors	8	100	10	100	15	100	16	100	16	100	20	100	55	100	

Source: Edmonds, History, pp.319-349.

(a) These two categories are not mutually exclusive.

TABLE 4

COLLEGE DEGREES HELD BY CENTRAL PROFESSORS(a)

(% of total professors for each year)

	1840		1850		1860		1870		1880		1890		1900		Ave/ fac
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	%
Liberal arts (BA, MA, PHB)	1	13	1	10	1	7	0	0	1	6	2	10	15	27	10
Ph.D.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	3
Science (BS, MS, SCD)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	3	15	8	15	5
M.D.	1	13	2	20	3	20	5	31	5	31	4	20	3	5	20
Other	1	13	1	10	1	7	0	0	1	6	0	0	1	2	5
Total college graduates	3	38	4	40	5	33	6	38	7	44	9	45	37	67	44
Total professors	8	100	10	100	15	100	16	100	16	100	20	100	55	100	

Source: Edmonds, History, pp.319-349.

(a) Honorary degrees are excluded if identified as such.

TABLE 5

PRIOR OCCUPATIONS OF CENTRAL PROFESSORS

(% of total professors for each year)

	1840		1850		1860		1870		1880		1890		1900		Ave/ fac
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	%
Teachers(a)															
Public	0	0	0	0	2	13	3	19	5	31	3	15	10	18	14
Private	1	13	2	20	1	7	2	13	1	6	1	5	5	9	10
College	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	6	2	12	4	20	7	13	9
Total	1	13	2	20	4	27	6	38	8	50	8	40	22	40	33
Principals(a)															
Public	0	0	1	10	3	20	5	31	5	31	6	30	5	9	19
Private	3	38	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7
Total	3	38	1	10	4	27	5	31	5	31	6	30	6	11	25
Total educators	4	50	3	30	8	53	11	69	13	81	14	70	28	51	58
Total public schoolmen	0	0	1	10	5	33	8	50	10	63	9	45	15	27	33

Source: Edmonds, History, pp. 319-349.

TABLE 6

SIZE OF CENTRAL'S STUDENT BODY AND FACULTY

Year	Students enrolled(a)	No. of profs(b)	Year	Students enrolled(a)	No. of profs(b)
1838	63	4	1881	480	16
1839	101	6	1882	523	16
1840	199	7	1883	559	16
1841	246	7	1884	576	16
1842	332	10	1885	619	16
1843	383	10	1886	610	16
1844	389	9	1887	623	15
1845	408	10	1888	598	16
1846	452	11	1889	548	18
1847	505	10	1890	561	21
1848	505	10	1891	609	22
1849	511	10	1892	606	22
1850	485	11	1893	631	23
1851	502	12	1894	706	28
1852	514	11	1895	773	33
1853	520	15	1896	865	38
1854	556	16	1897	1,044	43
1855	601	15	1898	1,164	45
1856	576	14	1899	1,228	46
1857	517	13	1900	1,235	54
1858	532	13	1901	1,319	54
1859	556	14	1902	1,366	54
1860	540	14	1903	1,438	58
1861	536	14	1904	1,474	62
1862	525	14	1905	1,729	72
1863	470	14	1906	1,942	75
1864	528	14	1907	1,987	76
1865	426	14	1908	1,905	75
1866	412	14	1909	1,943	86
1867	471	14	1910	2,301	84
1868	453	15	1911	2,282	84
1869	452	15	1912	2,166	89
1870	489	15	1913	2,285	108
1871	533	15	1914	2,481	105
1872	572	16	1915	2,560	107
1873	542	16	1916	2,927	82
1874	570	16	1917	2,074	83
1875	611	16	1918	2,186	81
1876	601	16	1919	1,956	96
1877	644	16	1920	2,802	106
1878	516	16			
1879	462	16			
1880	495	16			

Source: Philadelphia Board of Public Education, Annual Reports, 1838 to 1939.

(a) Enrollment at start of year.
(b) Includes all those who taught at the school and is not limited to those with the title of professor.

FOOTNOTES

1. While the average Philadelphia elementary school teacher in the 1870s persisted for 12 years (Fishbane 1979), the average high school professor during this period stayed on the job for 25 to 30 years. (Labaree 1983, table 2.2)

2. This figure comes from annual reports of the school board, quoted in Fishbane (1979). The board cites the figure to show that this level of pay is markedly low in comparison to other large cities -- including New York, Boston, Washington, Chicago, San Francisco, and Cincinnati.

3. These tables display data from the biographies in 10-year intervals, providing a cross-sectional view of the men who were on the Central faculty in each year shown. The are taken from Labaree (1983, Tables 2.2 to 2.7).

4. By far the most common college degree held by Central professors was not a B.A. but an M.D.

5. The school's principal became known as the president because of his role as the presiding officer of the governing body.

6. A detailed account of Central High School's role in the organization of the Philadelphia school system can be found in Labaree (forthcoming, chapter 3).

7. For an extended discussion of the significance of credentials for the history of the high school, see Labaree (1986).

REFERENCES

Bidwell, Charles E. 1965. "The School as a Formal Organization." In Handbook of Organization, James G. March ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 972-1022.

Elsbree, Willard S. 1939. The American Teacher. New York: American Book Co.

Fishbane, Richard B. 1979. "'The Shallow Boast of Cheapness:' Public School Teachers as a Profession in Philadelphia, 1865-1890." The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 103 (Jan.): 66-84.

Hofstadter, Richard. 1963. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Knopf.

Katz, Michael B. 1975. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, expanded ed. New York: Praeger.

Labaree, David F. 1983. "The People's College: A Sociological Analysis of the Central High School of Philadelphia, 1838-1939." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

_____. 1986. "Curriculum, Credentials and the Middle Class: A Case Study of a Nineteenth Century High School." Sociology of Education 59 (Jan.).

_____. Forthcoming. The Making of an American High School: Meritocracy for the Middle Class at the Central High School of Philadelphia, 1838-1939. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lortie, Dan C. 1975. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Weick, Karl. 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (3): 1-19.